

torical. Conversely, it is held that Mark and Luke know nothing of it, that it is not proved that Jews carried two Jewish names ("Peter" is an epithet, not a true name), that "the tax collector" of Matt. 10:3 is an early gloss intended originally to refer to James the son of Alpheus (who in some texts of Mark 2:14 is said to have been the tax collector), and that Origen and others denied the identity of Levi and Matthew (*see below*).

It seems obvious from the many problems in co-ordinating the four NT lists and doing justice to other data about the apostles in the gospels that the exact membership of the first group was soon forgotten. The early tradition of the identity of Levi and Matthew may or may not be sound.

If Matthew was Levi, he was in the service of Herod Antipas near or at Capernaum. It was his duty to levy on merchandise carried over the Damascus-Acre road and perhaps to tax the fishing and other industries of the area. Jesus' ministry around Capernaum provided many opportunities for contacts between the two prior to the occasion of the call (Mark 2:14).

Luke says that Levi entertained Jesus and a large company of tax collectors at a banquet in his home (5:29; the location is unclear in Mark 2:15). Was this Levi's way of celebrating his break with the old life, his method of introducing others to Jesus, or simply a gesture of gratitude to one who looked on tax collectors and other despised persons, not as horrible sinners, but as potential members of the kingdom of God?

The early church believed that Matthew wrote our first gospel (*see MATTHEW, GOSPEL OF*). Heraclon (Clement *Stromata* IV. ix), Origen (*Contra Celsum* I. xii), and others distinguished between Levi and Matthew. Eusebius said that Matthew first evangelized among Hebrews and then among other peoples (Euseb. *Hist.* III. 24. 6). Clement of Alexandria made Matthew a vegetarian (*Instructor* II. i). Heraclon (*Stromata* IV. ix) held that he died a natural death, but late legend dramatized his death by fire or the sword. It tended to confuse Matthew and Matthias. The tradition in the Babylonian Talmud (Sanh. 43a) concerning the trial and execution of "Matthai" is probably of no historical value.

**Bibliography.** T. Zahn, *Introduction to the NT*, II (1909), 506-9, 522-24. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal NT* (1924), pp. 204, 460-62, 466-67. B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (1930), pp. 39-41. V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (1952), pp. 202-3. E. J. Goodspeed, *The Twelve* (1957), pp. 25-28, 41-43; *Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist* (1959). E. P. BLAIR

**MATTHEW, GOSPEL OF.** The first, in order, of the gospels, and the opening book of the NT.

*See map "Palestine: Matthew, Mark and Luke," under MARK, GOSPEL OF.*

1. The order of the gospels
2. The traditional theory
3. The structure of Matthew
4. Main sources: Mark and Q
5. Special source or sources
6. OT quotations in Matthew
7. Material peculiar to Matthew
8. The "ecclesiastical" gospel
9. Background, place, and date

#### 10. Later influence Bibliography

**1. The order of the gospels.** Matthew is the first of the gospels, in the traditional order. But this is not necessarily the chronological order, and there is good reason for thinking that Matthew was one of the later gospels, rather than the first. Tradition has maintained its early date, and the location of Matthew as the first book of the NT has in turn supported the tradition, at least has maintained its wide acceptance in popular thought. But, in the first place, it is quite certain that Matthew is later than Mark, upon which, like Luke, it is based (*see GOSPELS*); further, as we shall see, its formulation of the gospel tradition, the problems with which it deals, especially those of the Palestinian or Syrian church, the carefully arranged order and articulation of its contents—all these probably point to a later date than Luke. Nevertheless, the fact that Luke and Matthew reflect no influence of one upon the other—save as the MS text of Matthew has influenced Luke, as it has influenced the other gospels—makes it impossible for us to claim that either of these two gospels must be later than the other. And anyway, their dates must be somewhere within the same generation, approximately between A.D. 90 or 95 and A.D. 115. So far as internal evidence goes, it is only a general probability that the order of the gospels was Mark, Luke, Matthew, John.

But this literary probability is confirmed archaeologically:

a) Since the time of Irenaeus (A.D. 180), and even before, the four beasts named in Rev. 4:7 have been identified, in Christian exegesis and art, with the four evangelists—the fourfold gospel canon had been formed presumably thirty years before Irenaeus wrote his work *Against Heresies* (see III. 11. 8). The lion was Mark, the ox was Luke, the "living creature with the face of a man" was Matthew, the flying eagle John. But there is nothing in these gospels, either covert reference or literary or theological character, to suggest the identifications.

Why should Mark be symbolized by a lion, Luke by an ox, Matthew by a man? The description is based on Ezek. 1:10, but the symbolism is modified—in Ezekiel each figure had "the face of a man in front, . . . the face of a lion on the right side, . . . the face of an ox on the left side, . . . the face of an eagle at the back." The author of Revelation has made this over into four separate creatures, not alike in form or features. The ultimate origin of the symbol may have been ancient Assyrian mythology, or rather the later Assyrian astral lore, in which Nergal was a winged lion, Marduk a winged bull, Nebo a human being, Ninib an eagle. These four astral gods were identified with the four cardinal directions—a view reflected in Irenaeus' insistence that there must be four gospels—and can be only four—as there are four cardinal directions, east, west, north, south, and four winds, four quarters of the earth, etc. Four was also Plato's "perfect" number, as later expositors pointed out. But the strange and unaccountable thing is Irenaeus' assumption that his readers will recognize, as something already known, that the lion symbolized Mark, etc.; and that, in other words, the order of the evangelists is the order of the four living creatures: Mark,

Luke, Matthew, John. This is unaccountable—unless it was the order in which, as some early Christians recalled (contrary to Papias, *ca. A.D. 135*, and others), the gospels had been written.

b) Further evidence for this tradition, as contrasted with the views of Papias and, later, Augustine, may be seen in the old Roman mosaics in the mausoleum of Galla Placidia, outside the Church of San Vitale at Ravenna. Here on a low, antique bookcase with sloping shelves the four gospels are pictured in the following order:

MARCVS	LVCAS
MATTEVS	IOANN

ES

The date of the mosaic is *ca. 440*. Galla Placidia was the sister of Honorius, the Emperor of the West, and her adventurous and really heroic life ended at Ravenna soon after she had ordered her mausoleum to be built. The date of the mosaics, 440, is scarcely more than a century after the Council of Nicea (325), and only nine years after the Council of Ephesus (431). It was evidently early enough to antedate the popular acceptance of Augustine's conjecture, based on Papias, according to which Matthew came first, then Mark, "walking in Matthew's footsteps and abiding by him," then Luke and John (Augustine *On the Agreement of the Evangelists* 1.2.4).

It cannot be said that a specific tradition underlies this order at Ravenna, though it is not improbable. Some explanation there must be. Possibly some artist or scholar, uninfluenced by the Papian-Augustinian view, preserved what once had been the traditional order, the same as that presupposed by Irenaeus. For these mosaics are not Byzantine but Roman—i.e., old Italian. The same order is found elsewhere: e.g., in the nearby Accademia at Venice, where the medallion reliefs in the ceiling of the Sala della Presentazione preserve the same order. And there are other instances: e.g., a Spanish copper-gilt set of plaques of the four evangelists in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (M 167), probably from the twelfth century; or a modern Russian brass binding, in relief, of an Evangelisterion by Ovchinnikov, where the order is reversed—the binding is modern, but its motif is ancient.

Luke	Mark
John	Matthew

Of course, such evidence is not conclusive, but it supports the probability advanced on the basis of the literary data, and—to say the least—demands an explanation, the simplest being the one already suggested by the internal evidence of the gospels themselves. On the other hand, there is no similar archaeological or literary evidence, so far as we know, of a similar early date of origin, supporting the Papian-Augustinian order.

Other orders are found in various MSS, but they are more easily explained: e.g., the placing of the apostles' names first, as in the Clermont list (from Egypt, *ca. 300*), Matthew, John, Mark, Luke; or the Cheltenham list, discovered by Mommsen in 1885

and sometimes called the Mommsen list (from North Africa, *ca. 360*), Matthew, Mark, John, Luke—where the apostles are kept together but Mark, as the "abridgment" of Matthew, follows next to it; or in Codex Bezae, probably from the fifth century, which has Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, and reflects the low estimate of Mark held commonly after the fourth century. (It is surprising that the copyists of D did not bring Luke-Acts into sequence.) *See bibliography.*

c) Moreover, the simplest explanation of the present order, found in our NT today, is that when the Papian-Augustinian hypothesis came to prevail, and was accepted as genuine tradition, the order of the gospels was altered only to the extent of shifting Matthew to first place, leaving Mark, Luke, and John where they had always been.

2. **The traditional theory.** The view that Matthew was the earliest gospel rests mainly upon the statement of Papias quoted by Eusebius in his *Church History* (III.39.16): "Matthew compiled [and arranged: the Greek verb, συνεράξατο, means both] the *logia* [oracles] in the Hebrew language [lit., dialect], and each one interpreted them [i.e., either translated or expounded them, or both] as best he could." The modern view that by *logia* Papias meant a life of Christ, or a gospel, or the sayings of Jesus, or Q, is most improbable. For hundreds of years, *logion* had been the technical term, in Greek, for a divine oracle, an inspired utterance—e.g., the oracles of Apollo delivered at Delphi. In time the usage spread to the OT, viewed as a collection of such divinely inspired utterances (cf. the "living oracles" delivered at Mount Sinai [Acts 7:38] and the "oracles of God" in Rom. 3:2; Heb. 5:12; I Pet. 4:11). In time, also, but not before the second century, the utterances of Christ were described as oracles. That Papias (unlike some modern writers) did not confuse *logia* with *logoi* ("words") is clear from the same chapter in Eusebius, § 14, where also Papias is quoted. In view of the character of Matthew's materials, and the large number of his quotations from the OT, viewed as "prophecies" which Christ "fulfilled" (see § 6 below), it is most probable that Papias meant exactly what he said: "Matthew compiled the prophetic oracles [of the OT] in the Hebrew dialect, and each one [each teacher in the early church] interpreted them as best he was able."

The later church fathers assumed without question that Matthew, being a disciple and the collector of the *logia*, must have been the first evangelist to write. They overlooked the fact that Papias himself—as quoted by Eusebius—discusses Mark before Matthew. So Irenaeus assumed (Her. III.1.1; Euseb. Hist. V.8.2-6; the old Anti-Marcionite gospel Prologues, from the period between Papias and Irenaeus, unfortunately lack the Prologue to Matthew; and the Muratorian Canon, *ca. 180-200*, is likewise fragmentary, though Luke is described as the "third" gospel—the order presupposed is probably the one we now have). So Clement of Alexandria assumed (Euseb. Hist. VI.14.5-7), who found it natural for the gospels to begin with Matthew's genealogy; so did Eusebius himself (Hist. III.24.5-8), and Jerome (*Proem to the Commentary on Matthew*, §§ 5-7), as well as Augustine. It cannot be proved that the order favored by the later church fathers rests upon early tradition. It looks

*logia*  
 ↓  
 word for  
 OT —  
 DIVINE  
 ORACLES  
 i.e. Jesus  
 in the  
 O.T.

*CHURCH FATHERS - LIVES OF BAPTISTS*

more like the rationalization of a *fait accompli*, as fatal for the historical interpretation of the gospels as was the assignment of the Pentateuch to Moses, or the Psalms to David, the author of Daniel to the days of Belshazzar, or the writing of Hebrews to the apostle Paul.

But the theory that Matthew was the earliest gospel, and that Mark abridged it—a view in flagrant opposition to Papias' view of Mark as based on Peter's teaching (Euseb. Hist. III.39.15)—or, in its modern form, that Matthew was first written in Hebrew (or Aramaic, as some writers who hold this view maintain), and then translated into Greek after Mark was written, is impossible. If Mark is an abridgment, it must abridge both Matthew and Luke, as its relations are as close to one as to the other; but no one could abridge two works and show equal reliance upon both, keeping them in perfect balance, but betraying none of the peculiar literary qualities or theological views of either. By far the simplest and most natural view of the Synoptic gospels is the one which looks upon Matthew and Luke as two entirely independent gospels—both, however, being based upon Mark as one of their two primary sources, the other being *Q* (see *Q; GOSPELS*). Luke cannot have used Matthew, nor Matthew Luke, for similar cogent reasons: neither is influenced by the other's distinctive "ideas," language, or theological convictions, and neither is affected by the peculiar sources of the other (L or M). Their sole bond of connection is Mark, which both use almost *in toto*. (This is not to deny the later influence of the text of Matthew upon that of Luke, perhaps in the second century; but that was after the finished gospels had been in circulation for some time.) Further, the view that Matthew, or any other of our four gospels, was originally written in Aramaic, though warmly advocated by several modern scholars, has been almost universally repudiated. The gospel traditions undoubtedly once circulated in oral Aramaic; but the written gospels are Greek books, and the basic source for Matthew and Luke was unquestionably a Greek work, the Gospel According to Mark. Even the advocates of Aramaic gospels have to assume that the translators of Matthew and Luke kept their eyes on both the Aramaic original and the already-existing Greek translation of Mark—a complicated hypothesis for which there is no evidence in the gospels themselves.

3. **The structure of Matthew.** When we examine the structure of the Gospel of Matthew, it is evident that the work, whatever its sources, has been very carefully and artistically arranged. Like many ancient Jewish works, it is in five "books" or main divisions—cf. the five books of the Pentateuch, and the Psalms, the five Megilloth, the five chapters (now six) of Pirke Aboth read on sabbath afternoons following Passover. These five divisions are alike in structure: each contains a narrative section (i.e., Jesus' ministry), followed by a didactic section (i.e., Jesus' teaching). In outline the gospel is as follows:

- I. The infancy narrative, chs. 1-2
- II. Discipleship, chs. 3-7
  - A. Narrative, the beginning of Jesus' ministry, chs. 3-4
  - B. Discourse, the Sermon on the Mount, chs. 5-7

- III. Apostleship, chs. 8-10
  - A. Narrative, Jesus' ministry of healing and teaching, 8:1-9:34
  - B. Discourse, the mission of the disciple, 9:35-10:42
- IV. The hidden revelation, 11:1-13:52
  - A. Narrative, growing opposition to Jesus, chs. 11-12
  - B. Discourse, the hidden teaching of the parables, 13:1-52
- V. The church, 13:53-18:35
  - A. Narrative, messiahship and suffering, 13:53-17:23
  - B. Discourse, church administration, 17:24-18:35
- VI. The Judgment, chs. 19-25
  - A. Narrative, controversies in Jerusalem, chs. 19-22
  - B. Discourse, criticism of the scribes and Pharisees, ch. 23; the doctrine of the Parousia, chs. 24-25
- VII. The passion narrative, chs. 26-27
- VIII. The Resurrection, ch. 28

Comparing Matthew with Mark, one finds it most striking that Matthew has kept Mark's order, for the most part, as well as preserving almost the entire contents of Mark (Luke, on the contrary, has long omissions); and Matthew has done this while impressing upon his finished work the subject arrangement just described. The gospel is clearly the work of a first-rate literary artist and teacher, who has reflected long and deeply upon the substance of the Christian gospel—both Jesus' life and his teaching—and has combined the teaching material with the biographical (or anecdotal) narratives in a most appropriate way. That the evangelist has behind him a "school" of Christian teachers and interpreters is not improbable; this is the way teaching was usually transmitted in the ancient world, especially in Semitic areas. Although many persons still hold that the author was Matthew the tax collector (cf. 9:9), who would have been a man accustomed to writing, to keeping accounts and making records, the gospel itself points to a later author—or authors. As is true of most ancient books based upon tradition, partly oral, partly written, many persons (cf. Luke 1:1) had a share in handing on the stories and sayings upon which it was based, and even in its literary formation. The gospels do not rest upon the literary production of four men, or their own personal recollection, but upon the widespread social memory of the larger group, the whole Christian church, from its beginning, in the particular area where each gospel was finally produced. If the Gospel of Matthew was produced in Syria—i.e., either in Antioch or somewhere in its hinterland (as Bacon held)—this would still be within the area of bilingual Hellenized Semitic culture; this hypothesis well accounts, not only for the language of the gospel, its Jewish as well as its Greek background, its thoughts, the institutional development of the church which it takes for granted, but also for the same phenomena in the cognate writing, the *Didache* (or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," now found among the *APOSTOLIC FATHERS*). As Paul Wernle said (see *bibliography*), the author of Matthew was "a Hellenist."

**4. Main sources: Mark and Q.** In addition to his use of Mark as his basic source, the author also uses the collection, oral or written, of Jesus' sayings which modern scholars call "Q," from German *Quelle*, "source" (i.e., as Bernhard Weiss and others used the term, the "apostolic" source; *see also SYNOPTIC PROBLEM*). This was no doubt originally an Aramaic collection (and therefore not the *logia* collected by Matthew "in the Hebrew dialect," according to Papias, *see § 2 above*); but it had already been translated into Greek, and was used by both Luke and Matthew in its Greek form—though clearly with occasional reference—certainly in Matthew's use—to the underlying Aramaic. Since Matthew has arranged this sayings material to meet the requirements of his didactic organization of the gospel (i.e., by main subjects, in five "books"), it seems probable that the original order of Q is better preserved by Luke, whose aim is not so much subject arrangement as historical continuity, and who makes no effort to rearrange Q by any topical order of his own. In fact, when we examine this Q material, in its Lukan order, we find that it already had an order of its own, quite different from both Matthew's topical arrangement and the order of Luke's material. Obviously it begins with John the Baptist and the beginning of Jesus' ministry; obviously it had to end with Jesus' teaching about the coming Parousia of the Son of man and the Last Judgment. But the main, central section of Q is on the subject of discipleship, as if this were veritably an ancient "Master's Guide for His Disciples," which Matthew made over into a manual for church doctrine, order, discipline, and worship.

As identified by most modern NT scholars, the contents of Q were as in Table 1 (in the order of Luke). No special theory of origin, or of some possibly ampler form of which this is an abridgment, or of authorship, is presupposed by the following list. Q is simply the material, common to Luke and Matthew, not derived from Mark: its extraction and isolation is almost a mathematical or physical process. Obviously, some explanation of its origin ought to be possible. At the moment, the only fact to be emphasized is the high value placed on this source by both the later Synoptists, Luke and Matthew. In Table 1, probable passages, whose inclusion is all but self-evident, are cited within brackets.

Table 1  
The Contents of Q

John the Baptizer:

3:[2b], 3a, 7b-9, John's preaching of repentance (cf. Matt. 3:1-10)  
3:16-17, John's prediction of the coming Judge (cf. Matt. 3:11-12)

The ordeal of the Messiah:

4:1b-12, the Temptation (cf. Matt. 4:1-11)

Jesus' public teaching:

6:20-49, the Sermon on the Plain (or Mountain; cf. Matt. 5:3-12, 39-48; 7:12, 1-5, 16-27; 10:24-25; 12:33-35; 15:14)

The response to Jesus' teaching:

7:1-5b-10, the centurion's faith (cf. Matt. 8:5-13)  
7:18a, 19, 22-28, 31-35, John's emissaries; Jesus' words about John (cf. Matt. 11:2-6, 7-19)  
9:57b-62, various followers (cf. Matt. 8:19-22)

The mission of the Twelve:

10:2-16, the mission of the disciples (cf. Matt. 9:37-38; 10:7-16, 40; 11:21-23)  
[10:17b-20, the return of the Twelve]  
10:21b-24, the rejoicing of Jesus (cf. Matt. 11:25-27; 13:16-17)

Jesus' teaching about prayer:

11:2-4, the Lord's Prayer (cf. Matt. 6:9-13)  
[11:5-8, the parable of the friend at midnight]  
11:9-13, constancy in prayer (cf. Matt. 7:7-11)

Controversy with the scribes and Pharisees:

11:14-23, the charge of collusion with Beelzebul (cf. Matt. 12:22-30)  
11:24-26, the story of the unclean spirit (cf. Matt. 12:43-45)  
11:29b-32, the warning contained in the "sign of Jonah" (cf. Matt. 12:38-42)  
11:33-36, Jesus' sayings about light (cf. Matt. 5:15; 6:22-23)  
11:39b, 42-43, [44], 46-52, the controversy with the scribes and Pharisees (cf. Matt. 23:4-36)

Jesus' teaching about discipleship (especially the duties of disciples when persecuted):

12:2-12, the testimony of disciples amid adversaries (cf. Matt. 10:26-33; 12:32; 10:19-20)  
12:22-31, on freedom from care (cf. Matt. 6:25-33)  
12:33b-34, on treasure (cf. Matt. 6:19-21)  
12:39-40, 42-46, three parables on watchfulness (cf. Matt. 24:43-51a)  
12:49-53, messianic divisions (cf. Matt. 10:34-36)  
[12:54-56, signs of the times (cf. Matt. 16:2-3)]  
12:57-59, the duty of speedy reconciliation (cf. Matt. 5:25-26)

13:18-21, the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven: the steady growth of the kingdom despite opposition (cf. Matt. 13:31-33)

13:24-29, the narrow way (cf. Matt. 7:13-14; 7:22-23; 8:11-12)

13:34-35, the fate of Jerusalem (cf. Matt. 23:37-39)

14:11=18:14, on self-exaltation (cf. Matt. 18:4; 23:12)

14:16-23, the parable of the great supper (cf. Matt. 22:1-10)

14:26-27, on hating one's next of kin, and on bearing the cross (cf. Matt. 10:37-38)

14:34-35, the saying on salt (cf. Matt. 5:13)

15:4-7, the parable of the lost sheep (cf. Matt. 18:12-14)

[15:8-10, the parable of the lost coin]

16:13, on serving two masters (cf. Matt. 6:24)

[16:16-18, the Law and the Prophets were until John; on divorce (cf. Matt. 11:12-13; 5:18, 32)]

17:1-2, on offenses (cf. Matt. 18:6-7)

17:3-4, on forgiveness (cf. Matt. 18:15, 21-22)

17:6, on faith (cf. Matt. 17:20b)

The coming Parousia:

17:23-24, 26-30, 34-35, 37b, the Parousia (cf. Matt. 24:26-28, 37-39; 10:39; 24:40-41, 28)

19:12-13, 15b-26, the parable of the entrusted talents (cf. Matt. 25:14-30)

[22:28-30, the apostles' thrones (cf. Matt. 19:28)]

A study of this table, especially of the section on discipleship, and even more a study of the passages in a "harmony" like *Gospel Parallels* (in English) by B. H. Throckmorton or the latest edition of A. Huck's

*Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* (in Greek, but with English headings, edited by H. Lietzmann and F. L. Cross) will make clear Matthew's method of using Q and rearranging it to fit the Markan outline, which he has already taken over, abridged, and reorganized.

**5. Special source or sources.** Not only has Matthew rearranged Q to suit his arrangement by subject; he has also added considerable material which is peculiarly his own, not shared with any other NT writer. Many scholars (e.g., B. H. Streeter) designate this material, or large parts of it, with the letter "M"—just as they designate Luke's peculiar material by the letter "L." Peculiar to Matthew is the genealogy of Jesus (1:1-17), which cannot be identified with that of Luke (3:23-38) save for thirteen names between Abraham and David—where the agreement probably rests upon a common use of I Chr. 2:1-15 or Ruth 4:18-22, but not I Chr. 3:10-19, except for the two names Shealtiel (Salathiel) and Zerubbabel (from I Chr. 3:17-19), and, of course, Joseph, who was known to Christian tradition as the father of Jesus. (Matthew and Luke do not agree on the name of Joseph's father, nor any other ancestors between Zerubbabel and Joseph, a period of *ca.* 460 years, to which Matthew assigns twelve generations, Luke nineteen.) But Matthew's genealogy is artistic, schematic, arranged (presumably) in three groups of fourteen generations (1:17), from Abraham to Jesus (actually there are fourteen plus fourteen plus twelve generations). The great point of the two genealogies is evidently Jesus' royal descent, from David and from Abraham, in Matthew; and his universal human ancestry, his descent from Adam, who was figuratively or typically the "Son of God," in Luke (3:38).

Peculiar to Matthew are also the account of the birth of Jesus and the story of his infancy, the Wise Men ("magi," or astrologers) from the East, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Palestine and settlement in Nazareth after Herod's death (1:18-2:23). All this special material, which has only the faintest parallels in Luke's infancy narrative (chs. 1-2) and is really incompatible with Luke's narrative as a whole, is an example of Jewish Christian "midrash"—i.e., the imaginative elaboration, in story form, of a striking text or series of texts, combined with a certain element drawn from historical tradition somewhat as a modern historical writer describes an event for which information is very scanty, but uses inference and imagination, and (above all) endeavors to write "in character"—i.e., appropriately—to the person or persons involved. Much of the "historical" writing in the OT is of this nature—not annalistic data drawn from written records, but imaginative, poetic, descriptive. Much of the ancient historical literature of the East, in general, had this character. And even the more "scientific" historical writing of the Greeks and Romans often allowed for such an element, especially in writers who dealt, not with a narrowly limited and fairly recent or contemporary period like Thucydides or Tacitus, but with the more distant past, as did Herodotus and Livy. Where annalistic or factually recorded history did not exist, we can either have its imaginative reconstruction, using whatever data are available (in this case chiefly OT texts), or go without—and the Christian church decidedly preferred an appropriate story. Thus Matthew's narrative be-

gins: "Now the birth [or origin, *genesis*] of the Messiah was like this"—translating literally from what many scholars believe to be the best Greek text (1:18). Here the central text, in which the story centers, is Isa. 7:14 as read in the LXX, not the Hebrew:

Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel.

The doctrine of the Virgin Birth, found only here in Matthew and in Luke 1:34-35 (though Luke's present text may be due to textual conformation; *see below*), and nowhere else in the NT, is clearly an inference from the LXX translation of Isaiah; and in the first or second century such an inference would be perfectly natural and unquestioned. If many great and famous men were believed to be the sons of virgin mothers, or supernaturally born—and there was then no "scientific" objection to the belief—why should not Matthew conclude that the LXX verse referred to the birth of the Messiah, and had been "fulfilled" at Jesus' conception and birth? *See JESUS CHRIST.*

So also the story of the search for his birthplace, and its location in Bethlehem on the basis of ancient prophecy (2:1-6); and the terrible tale of Herod's murder of the children at Bethlehem, and of the flight into Egypt—a mingling of prophecy, interpretation, fancy, and fact, all "in character": for Herod was a grisly murderer, as we know from Josephus, and Rachel's "children" were slain (though Ramah was not Bethlehem), and Egypt was often a refuge for Jews driven out of their homeland (though *Nazōraios*, in 2:23, does not mean "Nazarene," and it is impossible to find this text in the OT). This "midrashic" type of narrative, immediately recognizable to anyone familiar with ancient Jewish literature, is not only found here and there in the main body of the gospel, which is based on Mark, but reappears in quantity again at the end. The story of Peter's walking on the water and his loss of faith (14:28-31), the blessing of Peter and the promise of the keys (16:17-19)—these are attached to Markan pericopes, and are few in number. Far more ample are the amplifications of the passion and resurrection narratives: the designation of Judas as the betrayer (26:25); the rebuke of Peter's resistance to and Jesus' acceptance of suffering as in accordance with the Scriptures (26:52-54); the death of Judas (27:3-10, also in accordance with scripture—three passages woven together—though the story contradicts the one in Acts 1:18-19); Pilate's wife's dream (27:19), and Pilate's dramatic washing his hands of responsibility and the impossible self-imprecation of "the people" (27:24-25); the earthquake following the death of Jesus on the cross (27:51b-53); the guard at the tomb (27:62-66); the second earthquake, at the Resurrection (28:2-4, again with a verse of scripture as the key [Eccl. 12:3 LXX]); the meeting of Jesus with the two Marys (28:9-10, a far better conclusion than Mark 16:8 provides); the bribing of the soldiers (28:11-15); and the resurrection appearance in Galilee (28:16-20) leading to the Great Commission—the sublime climax and conclusion to the whole gospel. All this special material is midrashic, and anyone familiar with the Jewish midrashim will recognize it as both typical and extraordinary. If one can rid his mind of the narrowly modern view of religious literature, which must be strictly factual

to be "true," and can recognize in imaginative writing like this, in poetry and midrash, the presentation of something more than bare annals—viz., what the worshipers of Jesus came, in later Jewish Christian circles, to believe of him—the material will gain added meaning and value. It is like some of the material in the apocryphal gospels (*see GOSPELS, APOCRYPHAL*) or even in some of the imaginative "lives of Christ" of today; but it is older, more Jewish, more appropriate, and explicitly "in character." Fortunately, the question of "historicity" need not be raised—as in another example, the coin in the fish's mouth (17:24-7), or the two animals at the Triumphal Entry (21:1-7), for, as modern theologians now recognize, the Christian message of salvation is not dependent upon, or even proclaimed by means of, these elaborations of the gospel story. They must be viewed as fancies—ious fancies, no doubt, but still only the poetic or imaginative embellishment of the central narrative and message of the NT.

Another type of material, cognate to this, but more explicit, is found in the OT quotations which Matthew cites, predominantly—but not always—from the XX.

6. **OT quotations in Matthew.** These are over forty in number, as follows, not counting innumerable echoes of single words and phrases which give Matthew's speech its marked "biblical"—i.e., OT—coloring.

1) M. 1:23 (Isa. 7:14 LXX):

"Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel"

which means God with us."

The Hebrew reads "a young woman" and "she shall call." Matthew uses the LXX.

2) Matt. 2:6 (Mic. 5:2):

And you, O Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for from you shall come a ruler who will govern my people Israel.

This follows approximately the MT. Matthew's unconcern for the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence is reflected in his omission of the last two lines of Mic. 5.

3) Matt. 2:15 (Hos. 11:1): "Out of Egypt have I called my son."

Hosea's reference was to God's redemption of Israel from slavery in Egypt; Matthew reinterprets.

4) Matt. 2:18 (Jer. 31:15):

A voice was heard in Ramah, wailing and loud lamentation, Rachel weeping for her children; she refused to be consoled, because they were no more.

Again Matthew sees this "fulfilled," not in the history of Israel, but in the events surrounding the birth

of Christ. Here is an example of early Christian midrash, or imaginative interpretation of the OT.

5) Matt. 2:23: "He shall be called a Nazarene [or savorian]."

This long text, introduced by the same formula as other messianic prophecies in Matthew, is not from the OT, and may come from some lost apocryphal book. Just possibly it may be a covert "mystical" reference to Isa. 11:1 or 53:2.

6) Matt. 3:3 (Isa. 40:3 LXX):

The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

As in Mark 1:3, Matthew's text follows the LXX. The Hebrew had read: "In the wilderness prepare . . ."; but early Christian exegesis saw this verse "fulfilled" in John's preaching "in the wilderness."

7) Matt. 4:4 (Deut. 8:3 LXX):

Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.

Matthew, following the Greek translation, renders as poetry what Deuteronomy had set forth in prose. The same is true of Jesus' quotations from Deuteronomy in vss. 7, 10—the temptation narrative is almost a mosaic of Deuteronomic verses applied to the career of Jesus as Israel's true Messiah, one of the profoundest themes in the Gospel of Matthew.

8) Matt. 4:6 (Ps. 94:11-12):

He will give his angels charge of you.

On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone.

These two verses, indeed the whole of Ps. 91—so violently in contrast with Ps. 22, the passion psalm—must have given rise to much painful questioning in the early church. Why should Jesus die? Above all, why had God permitted his chosen Messiah to die on a cross? The whole temptation narrative is a midrashic or exegetical answer to this question.

9) Matt. 4:7 (Deut. 6:16): "You shall not tempt the Lord your God."

Again Israel's experience—and the divine oracle addressed to the nation—is interpreted as referring to the individual and specifically to Christ: "You shall not put the LORD your God to the test, as you tested him at Massah." As generally in the Bible, "temptation" means "testing," "making trial of," "putting to the test" (see Eccl. 2:1 ff.).

10) Matt. 4:10 (Deut. 5:9; 6:13):

You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.

The whole OT forbids idolatry and polytheism—above all, the worship of evil spirits; positively, it commands the worship of God alone, the one and only God, as specifically in the Shema (Deut. 6:4-5) and in Isa. 43:11; 44:6, 8; 45:6, 21; 46:9; etc.

11) Matt. 4:15-16 (Isa. 9:1-2):

The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, toward the sea, across the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles—the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light has dawned.

I.e., "Galilee of [or surrounded by] the Gentiles" will see the dawn of the new day in Jesus' proclamation of the gospel. This is another good example of messianic reinterpretation of the OT.

12) Matt. 5:5 (Ps. 37:11): "Blessed are the meek."

This is taken directly from the Psalter: "The meek shall possess the land," in order to complete the num-

ber (nine) of the Beatitudes in Matthew's recension.

13) Matt. 5:21 (Exod. 20:13; 21:12): "You shall not kill."

This and the other OT verses quoted in Matt. 5 belong to the reinterpreted halachah of the gospel, which widens and deepens the range of the law's demands by including, more explicitly than in the Pentateuch, the inner attitudes and motives of men. The law is not rejected or abrogated (5:17-20), but made more authoritative than ever, as contrasted with any purely external legal casuistry, dealing only with overt actions.

14) Matt. 5:27 (Exod. 20:14): "You shall not commit adultery."

15) Matt. 5:31 (Deut. 24:1): on divorce.

In the Pentateuch, the privilege of divorce is taken for granted, and the text in Deuteronomy rules out the possibility of collusion or blackmail through remarriage. But Jesus attacked the whole practice of divorce and remarriage (Mark 10:2-12; cf. Mal. 2:13-16).

16) Matt. 5:33 (Deut. 23:22): on oaths.

17) Matt. 5:38 (Deut. 19:21): the *lex talionis*.

18) Matt. 5:43 (cf. Lev. 19:18): "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy."

The second half of this command cannot be found in the OT, though it is presupposed in some passages (e.g., the command to exterminate the Canaanites, and the psalmist's "Do I not hate them that hate thee, O **LORD**?" [Ps. 139:21]). But Jesus' teaching included all men within the range of perfect love—which must be like the love of God.

19) Matt. 5:48 (Deut. 18:13; Lev. 19:2): "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."

This is more than an echo of the OT; it reinterprets and applies the command to be upright in God's sight: one must be *like* God.

20) Matt. 8:17 (Isa. 53:4): "He took our infirmities and bore our diseases."

Like 12:18-21, this is an example of the evangelist's recognition of the character of Jesus as anticipated and described by Isaiah. The "fulfilment" was more than a series of external events; it involved deep insight into the divine purpose of God's revelation. To Matthew, the aspects of Jesus' messiahship which meant most were not power and glory—though he emphasizes these more than any other evangelist—but gentleness, tenderness, divine compassion.

21) Matt. 9:13 (Hos. 6:6; cf. I Sam. 15:22): "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice."

This is another instance of Matthew's religious interpretation of the OT.

22) Matt. 10:35 (Mic. 7:6): family divisions in the last time—a common feature in apocalyptic descriptions of the "messianic woes," the social and political chaos which was to precede the end of the present age.

23) Matt. 11:5 (Isa. 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1; cf. Luke 4:18-19): the supernatural gifts of the Messiah—i.e., of the divinely appointed and anointed King of Israel in the age to come.

These were often emphasized: he should be a powerful ruler, as in Isa. 9; Ps. 110; but also, as in Ps. 72, he should be the friend of the poor and suffering, and should bring them relief and release.

24) Matt. 11:10 (Exod. 23:20; Mal. 3:1):

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee.

The words of Malachi have been transformed (as in the LXX, and in Mark 1:2) under the influence of Exod. 23:20, and then reinterpreted as a reference to the coming of John the Baptist, who is Jesus' predecessor and the preparer of his "way." Matt. 11:10 may be the source of the expanded text in Mark (1:2b is not in "Isaiah").

25) Matt. 12:7 (Hos. 6:6; cf. I Sam. 15:22; Matt. 9:13): identical with 21 *above*.

26) Matt. 12:8-21 (Isa. 42:1-4; cf. 41:9):

Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim justice to the Gentiles. He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will any one hear his voice in the streets; he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smoldering wick, till he brings justice to victory; and in his name will the Gentiles hope.

This long quotation is approximately identical in wording with Isa. 42:1-4, but has been influenced by ch. 41. See 20 *above*.

27) Matt. 12:40 (Jonah 2:1): "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

This gives Matthew's literalizing interpretation (cf. the literalism in 21:1-9) of the saying and its OT reference: the forms found in Mark 8:12; Luke 11:30; and here in Matthew represent a series of interpretations.

28) Matt. 13:14-15 (Isa. 6:9-10):

You shall indeed hear but never understand, and you shall indeed see but never perceive. For this people's heart has grown dull, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and their eyes they have closed, lest they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn for me to heal them.

Matthew gives in full the passage which the saying in Mark 4:12 gives briefly and which Luke 8:10 echoes. Matthew is surely right in explaining Jesus' use of parables "because seeing they do not see"—as against Mark's and Luke's "so that," as if Jesus intended to withhold the truth from his hearers. Their interpretation of Isa. 6:9-10 seems to be justified by the OT language, where the final result is ascribed to the divine purpose; but Matthew assumes that the judgment of blindness has already overtaken his hearers, and therefore Jesus had to use simple figurative language to help them understand.

29) Matt. 13:35 (Ps. 78:2):

I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter what has been hidden since the foundation of the world.

This is a further scriptural support for the straightforward, natural understanding of Jesus' purpose in using parables. The psalmist is referred to as a

'prophet"—for Matthew the whole of the OT was "prophetic" of the Latter Days and especially of Christ.

30) Matt. 15:4 (Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16; Exod. 21:17; Lev. 20:9): "Honor your father and your mother. . . . He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die."

Both the positive commandment and the negative threat of penalty—a draconic survival of primitive custom—are given by Mark and Matthew. Together they set the background for Jesus' criticism of scribal laxity in interpretation of the halachah. This, of course, reflects Matthew's viewpoint also.

31) Matt. 15:8-9 (Isa. 29:13 LXX):

This people honors me with their lips,  
but their heart is far from me;  
in vain do they worship me,  
teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.

The passage (given in the same form in Mark 7:6-7) differs somewhat from the MT (for which see RSV), and is doubtless in the form in which it circulated in the early Gentile churches, where it expressed the church's rejection of Jewish traditions.

32) Matt. 18:16 (Deut. 19:15): "Take one or two others along with you, that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses."

This is a salutary provision in the Jewish law (see N.T. 35:30; Deut. 19:15-21; 17:6) is taken over by Matthew into the Christian halachah, the subject of the present context. That it should be required among Christians is clear from I Cor. 6 and later history.

33) Matt. 19:4-5 (Gen. 1:27; 2:24): "Have you not read that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one'?"

This passage is quoted as in Mark 10:6-8, approximately as in the Hebrew. So also is vs. 7 (Deut. 24:1).

34) Matt. 19:18-19 (Exod. 20:12-16; Deut. 5:16-20; Lev. 19:18): The commandments necessary for life, as in Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; but in a different order from Exodus, and with the addition of Lev. 19:18 (which some ancient authorities omit; see 43-44 below).

35) Matt. 21:5 (Isa. 62:11; Zech. 9:9):

Tell the daughter of Zion,  
Behold, your king is coming to you,  
humble, and mounted on an ass,  
and on a colt, the foal of an ass.

This is also quoted, in abridged form, in John 12:15. In both passages there is a significant variation from the OT—the omission of line 4 of Zech. 9:9: "Triumphant and victorious is he," perhaps as inappropriate to the present occasion.

36) Matt. 21:9 (Ps. 118:25-26; cf. II Sam. 14:4): "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest!"

All four gospels give this verse, but in different forms (cf. Mark 11:9-10; Luke 19:38; John 12:13). Matthew alone omits mention of "the king" or "the kingdom of David"—though the title "Son of David" implies it. Cf. 35 above.

37) Matt. 21:13 (Isa. 56:7; Jer. 7:11): "My house shall be called a house of prayer."

As in Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46, two OT quotations are combined: the description of the temple is from Isaiah; the criticism of the priesthood echoes that of Jeremiah, who accused them of murder and oppression, not merely of extortion as in some modern expositions of the gospels. The temple was no "den" of petty "thieves," but a "cave of armed bandits," robbers of the whole nation, including the poor.

38) Matt. 21:16 (Ps. 8:2):

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings  
thou hast brought perfect praise.

This is found only in Matthew. The text varies from the MT, but paraphrases it.

39) Matt. 21:33 (cf. Isa. 5:1-2; 27:2): "There was a householder who planted a vineyard, and set a hedge around it, and dug a wine press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to tenants, and went into another country."

The language echoes that of Isaiah, but this was only natural in the telling of the story. It is not cited as a quotation.

40) Matt. 21:42 (Ps. 118:22-23):

The very stone which the builders rejected  
has become the head of the corner;  
this was the Lord's doing,  
and it is marvelous in our eyes.

As in Mark 12:10-11, abridged in Luke 20:17, this is understood as an explicit reference to Jesus, and a rebuke to his critics.

41) Matt. 22:24 (Deut. 25:5-6; Gen. 38:8): "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies, having no children, his brother must marry the widow, and raise up children for his brother.'"

This is a typical "school problem," cited in Mark 12:19; Luke 20:28, and one which doubtless still caused trouble for early Christian believers in the resurrection—who usually (unlike Paul in I Cor. 15; II Cor. 5; etc.) viewed it as material and physical.

42) Matt. 22:32 (Exod. 3:6): ". . . I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' He is not God of the dead, but of the living."

As in Mark 12:26; Luke 20:37, this is a fine example of early church exegesis which doubtless went back to Jesus' own expositions of the Scriptures, in the synagogues and elsewhere publicly.

43) Matt. 22:37 (Deut. 6:5): "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind."

This commandment appears also in Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27. It was a part of the Shema, recited by every observant Jew twice or even thrice a day. But the unique thing about the teaching of Jesus was his combination of the "second commandment" with it, as follows:

44) Matt. 22:39 (Lev. 19:18): "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

This is also in Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27. Rabbi Hillel had set forth the "Golden Rule" (Matt. 7:12), in its negative form ("Do not to another what you would not have him do to you"), as a "summary of the law." Jesus' characteristic emphasis added love to one's neighbor as like—or equal—to the first.

45) Matt. 22:44 (Ps. 110:1; cf. Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-43):

The Lord said to my Lord,  
Sit at my right hand,  
till I put thy enemies under thy feet.

Clearly this was one of the favorite "messianic" texts used in the early church (see Acts 2:34-35; I Cor. 15:25; Heb. 1:13; 10:13). Indeed, it was a text which exercised considerable influence upon the formulation of early Christian doctrine and theology.

46) Matt. 23:39 (Ps. 118:26): "Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord."

This is found also in Luke 13:35. The verse from the "Psalm of Ascents" might have been thought to be fulfilled at the entry into Jerusalem (see 36 above), but both Luke and Matthew (i.e., Q) give it a further significance: its final fulfilment will come to pass at the Parousia—which, as in much Jewish and early Christian thought, was somehow related to the fate of Jerusalem.

47) Matt. 24:7 (Isa. 19:2): "Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famines and earthquakes in various places."

This is from Mark 13:8; cf. Luke 21:10. The language is typical (cf. II Chr. 15:6), but the oracle against Egypt (Isa. 19:2) is still awaiting its complete fulfilment, on a universal scale.

48) Matt. 24:15 (Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11): the "desolating sacrilege spoken of by the prophet Daniel."

As in Mark 13:14 (but reinterpreted in Luke 21:20 as the siege of Jerusalem), this famous oracle was taken to refer, not to the desecration of the temple in 168 B.C., or to Caligula's proposed statue in A.D. 40, but to Antichrist standing in the holy place at the end of the age. Apocalyptic was constantly reinterpreted, in generation after generation.

49) Matt. 24:21 (Dan. 12:1): the "great tribulation."

This is as in Mark 13:19; again Luke reinterprets.

50) Matt. 24:29-31 (Isa. 13:10; 34:4; Zech. 12:10 ff; Dan. 7:13; Isa. 27:13; Zech. 12:10-14; Deut. 30:4): a mosaic of apocalyptic detail.

Some of this is already combined in Mark 13:24-27. Luke considerably abridges and tones down. Matthew, as usual, expands and emphasizes apocalyptic details.

51) Matt. 26:15 (Zech. 11:12): the payment of Judas.

Matthew makes explicit the "thirty pieces of silver," which in Mark 14:11; Luke 22:5 is only "money." Thus he prepares for the "fulfilment" of the oracle of Zechariah in 27:3-10 (see 55 below).

52) Matt. 26:31 (Zech. 13:7): "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered."

This is in Mark 14:27. It is again one of the more obvious passages of the OT to be interpreted of Jesus and his disciples (cf. John 16:32). Another interpretation is found in Matt. 9:36.

53) Matt. 26:38 (Pss. 42:6, 11; 43:5): "My soul is very sorrowful, even to death."

A most appropriate quotation, from one of the Passion Psalms, this is as in Mark 14:34; it is omitted by Luke (though see 12:49 ff). It was deeply rooted in the early Christian tradition (see John 12:27; Heb. 5:7).

54) Matt. 26:64 (Ps. 110:1; Dan. 7:13; cf. Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69): "Hereafter you will see the Son

of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven."

This is the cardinal passage for the apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus' second coming as Son of man in glory (see Mark 9:1; Luke 9:27; Matt. 16:28; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27; Matt. 24:30; Acts 7:56; Rev. 1:7; etc.). It had already been interpreted as a reference to the heavenly Messiah, *the Son of man*, in the "parables" of the book of Enoch (and see Matt. 25:31).

55) Matt. 27:9 (Zech. 11:12-13; Jer. 18:2-12; 19; 32:6-9; Exod. 9:12 LXX): the prophecy concerning the pieces of silver.

The prophecy is basically that found in Zechariah, but conflated with material from other OT passages. Jerome says he found the same text in an "apocryphal book of Jeremiah" (*Commentary on Matthew* VII.1. 228a; but see his *Epistle* 57.7). A totally different account of the death of Judas is given in Acts 1:18-19, with other supporting OT quotations.

56) Matt. 27:34 (Ps. 69:21): the wine mingled with gall.

Cf. Mark 15:23; Luke omits. This and the many following details of the Passion were identified in the OT by the early Christian evangelists and teachers—i.e., interpreters of scripture. See also John 19:28-29, 36-37.

57) Matt. 27:35 (Ps. 22:18): the casting of lots for Jesus' garments.

Cf. Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34; John 19:24. The division of the spolia by the crucifixion squad was customary. John adds a unique and highly symbolic detail.

58) Matt. 27:39 (Pss. 22:7; 109:25): "Those who passed by derided him, wagging their heads."

Cf. Mark 15:29; Luke 23:35. This is a further "fulfilment" of the oracle in the greatest of the Passion Psalms.

59) Matt. 27:43 (Ps. 22:8; cf. Wisd. Sol. 2:13, 18-20): "He trusts in God; let God deliver him now, if he desires him; for he said, 'I am the Son of God.'"

This taunt is peculiar to Matthew. But the cry, and the scandal of such apparently misplaced trust in God, rings throughout the Psalms, the book of Job, Isa. 53, and many other parts of the OT.

60) Matt. 27:46 (Ps. 22:1): "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

This is in Mark 15:43; Luke omits it, and substitutes Ps. 31:5 (Luke 23:46; cf. what he does in 23:34 and what John does in 19:30). The "cry of desolation"—or "cry of dereliction," as it is often called—was directly quoted from Ps. 22, either by Jesus himself, or by the early Christian evangelists, who took the cry to be the words of Jesus' last "great shout" (Mark 15:37).

61) Matt. 27:48 (Ps. 69:21): the sponge filled with vinegar.

As in Mark 15:36, even the tiny detail of the vinegar is added. Luke 23:36 takes it to be an act of mockery by the soldiers—not a very probable interpretation.

It is obvious that Matthew's "collection and arrangement of the OT oracles" (the *logia*), of which the sixty-one most obvious examples are listed here, is much fuller than that of any other evangelist—or any other writer in the NT, including Paul and the

authors of Hebrews and Revelation. Not limited to a dozen or fifteen well-known "proof texts," it is by far the fullest and most complete collection of passages bearing on the theme "Christ in the OT"—chiefly in the book of Isaiah, the "evangelical prophet," and in the Psalms, but also representative of the OT as a whole: the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke 24:27, 44). An early Christian writer like Papias, whose five books of exegesis on the "Oracles of the Lord" may have dealt with the same material, and who, like all other early Christians, greatly prized the testimonia found in the ancient Jewish scriptures, would naturally be strongly impressed by this feature in Matthew's work—the use of these same OT oracles—and therefore emphasized it in his account of the origin of Matthew's Gospel (Euseb. Hist. III.39.16; *see § 2 above*).

**7. Material peculiar to Matthew.** The "peculiar" material of Matthew clearly includes, not only the Christian midrashic "haggadah" just described, and the Christian "messianic" texts from the OT—i.e., texts messianically interpreted from the Christian point of view—but also examples of Christian exegesis and homiletics, and even of reinterpretation of the church's own tradition, such as we find in 3:14-15; 2:5-7; 13:36-43. It also includes formulations of Christian duty approaching those of a code—as in the Didache, the early Church Orders, and the early canons; the process of formulation is at least moving in that direction (see 10:41; 18:18; 19:10-12; 23:2-3, 8-10). Even early liturgical material is present, as in 11:25-30, the rejoicing of Jesus and the Evangelic Invitation, which some scholars view as a baptismal hymn, and the Great Commission in 28:18-20, which includes the baptismal formula. The Matthean version of the Lord's Prayer, in 6:7-13, which differs markedly from the parallel in Luke 11:2-4, must have been taken, as many scholars now believe, from the current worship of the church; and so is the oft-quoted promise: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (18:20). The Sinaitic Syr. MS even reads, in vs. 19: "If two of you agree on earth about anything concerning which they shall be asked [this could be a literal Syr. rendering of the Aramaic impersonal plural, 'which they'—i.e., people—'shall ask'] it will be binding in heaven." Here we have the early Christian assembly united, not only in worship, but also judicially (as in I Cor. 5:4b-5) or legislatively; indeed, it is not even the whole assembly, but a Christian local Sanhedrin, assembled for the purpose of rendering a decision upon some matter of duty, practice, or observance. The Jewish Christian outlook of the passage is obvious.

One of Matthew's chief characteristics is its emphasis on apocalyptic eschatology, which is heightened and underscored repeatedly (see 13:24-30; 20:1-16; 22:1-14; 25, *passim*). Most of Matthew's parables are given this strongly apocalyptic-eschatological emphasis, and the climax is the great panorama of the Last Judgment in 25:31-46, where the ethics of the gospel—love and compassion for the poor and helpless—is woven in with every silken fiber of this majestic tapestry: "As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me"—i.e., to the heavenly Son of man, enthroned in glory, judging all nations on the Last Day.

**8. The "ecclesiastical" gospel.** Matthew is sometimes described as the "ecclesiastical" gospel, and appropriately, for its interests are far more thoroughly centered in the church than are those of any other gospel—or any other writing of the NT. Here the church is not an ideal, as it is in Ephesians or in John, but the actual living body of worshipers and devotees of Christ and his teaching—a sect which originated within Judaism, but which is now more or less completely separated and living a life of its own. It is still in contact with Jews and with Jewish beliefs and practices. Much of the SERMON ON THE MOUNT (ch. 5) deals with the Christian interpretation—i.e., Jesus' interpretation—of the great commandments in the Law, which he came, not to destroy, but to "fulfill" (5:17-20), to deepen, widen, apply more consistently, and interpret in the light of the divine intention behind the command. The practices of piety (discussed in ch. 6) are those of the Pharisees and increasingly of all Jews in the first century—but with notable omissions (tithing, the food laws, and sabbath observance). These were part of a rule of life—prayer, fasting, almsgiving—which was rooted deeply in the older Judaism reflected in the Apoc., especially in Tobit, Judith, and Ecclesiasticus. The admonitions contained in the rest of the Matthean Sermon—i.e., those in 6:19-34, which reinforce the requirement of sincerity and simplicity and the absence of ostentation and pride in the observance of the three rules of life, and in ch. 7, where censoriousness is forbidden and complete self-dedication to the will of God is commanded—conclude with the magnificent and unforgettable parable of the two housebuilders (7:24-27), the point of which is clearly the indispensable requirement of not only hearing but also doing the "words" of Jesus. The Christian disciple must not only say, "Lord, Lord," but actually practice the Lord's teaching (vss. 21-23).

Moreover, the Jewish ties of Matthew and his circle (teachers, presumably, in the early Palestinian or Syrian church) are implied in ch. 23, where "the scribes sit on Moses' seat." (The addition, "and the Pharisees," is perhaps an early gloss; the scribes were the official teachers, while the Pharisees were only a society of pious, devoted laymen who undertook to carry out the full requirements of the law as expounded by its scribal interpreters. Of course, the two groups were closely related.) As the authoritative "teachers of righteousness"—i.e., of the Jewish religion—they are to be obeyed: "So practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach, but do not practice." Here their authority is recognized, though their personal character is sharply criticized (23:1-12). Seven tremendous woes are pronounced against them in 23:13-33, each following a standard literary pattern; to this is added the threat of the impending Judgment (vss. 34-36), followed by the lament over Jerusalem (vss. 37-39)—a powerful introduction to the apocalyptic discourse in chs. 24-25. The evils of the present—religious insincerity and hypocrisy, greed, false teaching, a human tradition which obscured the divine commands and substituted the minutiae of petty legal rulings for the basic requirements of "justice, mercy, and faith"—these features in the religion of Jesus' day, and equally in that of the evangelist, are leading directly to the Day

of Judgment. No OT prophet, no Jewish apocalyptic, no Qumran or Essene secretary, no Stoic or Cynic street preacher, ever castigated the evils of his time in more searching, more inescapable invective.

**9. Background, place, and date.** Hence the background of Matthew must be sought in some area where Judaism and early Christianity still overlapped, were in close contact—and in conflict. The area which best suits these requirements is probably N Palestine or Syria, perhaps Antioch; and the date, some time after the fall of Jerusalem in 70—probably a considerable time after this date, when apocalyptic eschatology has had a long enough period to decline and revive again—as in IV Ezra and II Baruch. A. H. McNeile and others have dated the book between 70 and 115, when Ignatius of Antioch apparently quotes the gospel, or—at least—is familiar with traditions which Matthew also uses. E.g., his Letter to the Ephesians, ch. 19, seems to show acquaintance with Matthew's birth narrative, though with a difference—including midrashic elements very like those in Matthew. "The virginity of Mary and her giving birth were hid from the Prince of this world, and so also was the death of the Lord. [There were] three mysteries of a cry [or, of shouting] which took place in the silence of God. How then was he manifested to the ages [or, aeons]? A star shone out in heaven, brighter than all other stars, and its light was indescribable and its newness [sudden appearance?] was most strange, and all the rest of the stars together with the sun and moon formed a chorus about it, but its light far outshone them all; and there was perplexity as to whence this novelty [astronomers would say, *nova*] came, so unlike them. In consequence, all magic was dissolved and every bond of wickedness disappeared; ignorance was taken away, the old kingdom [of evil] was wholly destroyed, God being manifested humanly for the renewal of eternal life, and what had been prepared by God had its beginning. Hence all things were moved, because the destruction of death was being set in motion."

Such a passage does not prove the dependence of Ignatius upon Matthew, but suggests it; and it also illustrates the midrashic type of exegesis and the quasi-Gnostic speculation which were current in the Syrian milieu of Ignatius and also—most probably—of Matthew. It was in such an atmosphere that early Syrian Gnosticism arose; and it was also the atmosphere of the surrounding Greco-Roman-Jewish syncretism in which Matthew lived and taught. The anchorage of the Christian tradition in actual history, rather than in theosophical fancy or speculation, and the valiant defense of Jesus' firm ethical and religious teaching, his proclamation of the coming kingdom of God, his actual death and resurrection, stand out ever more clearly against this background. The echoes of current debate which we catch between the lines of Matthew's gospel—as in 5:3: "poor in spirit" (contrast Luke 6:20); or 5:19, the threat of antinomianism; or 5:32; 19:9, the exception clause in the prohibition of divorce; or 19:12, the answer to the Encratites, who forbade marriage; or 18:22, the problem of the "unforgivable" sin; or 18:15 ff, the problem of scandal in the church; or 17:24-27, the problem of the temple tax (now, presumably, paid to Rome—i.e., the *Judaicus fiscus*)—all these and many more references

to current issues help to fix upon a probable milieu and approximate date for Matthew—viz., Syria around the end of the first century.

The Judaism presupposed by Matthew is that of the postbellum period when the Jews were still crushed and defeated after the catastrophe of A.D. 70, when Jerusalem fell and the temple was destroyed. It was a time of recession and retreat, when renewed study of the sacred scriptures and deeper devotion to prayer and synagogue worship took the place of the ancient sacrificial system with its attendant liturgical forms. The Jews were determined to survive, despite the loss of their freedom, their temple, and their ancient ritual. The hierarchical party of the Sadducees disappeared, and the popular lay leaders, the Pharisees, with their scribal teachers, completely took over the religious leadership of what was left of the nation. Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai, a saintly scholar who survived the fall of Jerusalem, obtained permission from the Romans to establish a school at Jamnia, which became a center of fresh religious learning and activity. Sectarian errors were weeded out. The malediction against the *minim* and the apostates (not necessarily limited to Christians) was added to the daily prayer, the Eighteen Benedictions. The canon of the OT was settled. The more recent and as yet unrecognized works which circulated in Greek at Alexandria (approximately our APOCRYPHA), and also the clandestine or "hidden" writings now called PSEUDEPIGRAPHA were firmly rejected. Only the books already in use in the synagogue—i.e., the Hebrew scriptures (our OT)—were recognized, pronounced canonical and inspired, and authorized for use in worship and study. The Greek translation of the OT, the SEPTUAGINT, was repudiated—one rabbi said that Israel should observe as a fast day the day on which it was completed—or begun! The world mission of Judaism was suspended, and writers like Philo of Alexandria, who had endeavored to synthesize Judaism and Greek culture or philosophy, were discouraged. (The Christians, not the Jews, preserved Philo's writings for posterity.) This was the rallying time of resurgent Judaism, and the beginning of what George F. Moore called the "rise of normative Judaism"—i.e., the movement which eventually resulted, in the fourth and fifth centuries, in the achievement of the classical or normal, Judaism which has been known to history ever since.

Along with this revival of Judaism went a renewed emphasis upon and cultivation of apocalyptic thought, a movement which Matthew both reflects and shares. (Matthew's apocalyptic passages, when compared with those in Mark or Luke, fully illustrate this; cf. 24:4-36 with Mark 13:5-37; Luke 21:8-36; to this chapter Matthew appends ch. 25, which is wholly apocalyptic-eschatological in doctrine and emphasis.) The revived apocalypticism in contemporary Jewish religious thought is represented, as we have seen, by II Baruch and IV Ezra.

Another tie with contemporary history is the renewed emphasis on refusal to seize weapons and join the proposed revolt against Rome (e.g., 26:52). Sufficient time had elapsed for a revived Zealotism to emerge, promising a quick victory against the oppressor. This must have been long after 70, and may even reflect conditions under Trajan, when, ap-

parently, the Jewish uprising in North Africa and in Cyprus and Syria was shared to some extent in Palestine—though the records are incomplete: this is one more lacuna in early imperial history. Certainly we know that just before and during the revolt under Hadrian (132-35) the Christians were urged and even compelled to join the forces of Akiba and Bar Cocheba in the great rebellion. Bar Cocheba may be one of the pseudo messiahs referred to in 24:5. The story of Hegesippus which describes the arrest and examination of Jude's grandsons (Euseb. *Hist. III.20*) in the time of Domitian also reflects the conditions of the time, and the Christian abstention from armed resistance or insurrection. Finally, 24:12 also reflects the growing tension: "Because wickedness [i.e., lawlessness, *anomia*] is multiplied, most men's love will grow cold."

**10. Later influence.** Throughout the centuries since this gospel was written, it has exercised a great and dominant influence. Not only have its MSS influenced the text of the other gospels (especially, e.g., in the Old Syr. version); not only have its pericopes been the favored ones in the church's liturgies, outnumbering those chosen from the other gospels; not only have its formulations of favorite passages (e.g., the Beatitudes, the Lord's Prayer, the passion narrative, as in Bach's setting) prevailed over the parallels in the other gospels; but its theology has been a dominant influence, comparable only with that of John.

Matthew's theology is a Christianized Jewish set of doctrines, with a far from normal Jewish or even later Christian emphasis upon apocalyptic eschatology. Yet it does not go all the way with modern "thoroughgoing" apocalyptic: Matthew has room for the world church and its world mission. His conception of the person of Christ is thoroughly apocalyptic; and yet the deeply religious and ethical characteristics of his Christology are unmistakable, and rarely matched (as in the "parables" of Enoch), and not at all equaled in I Thess. 4; II Thess. 1; Jude; or Revelation.

Above all, the ecclesiastical influence of such a passage as Matt. 16:17-19 has been incalculable, and is fitly symbolized by the great inscription about the dome of St. Peter's in Rome: *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam*. There is no parallel to this in any other gospel, and its underlying assumption of Peter's primacy is rejected or ignored everywhere else in the NT. Modern scholars believe that this piece of midrash reflects the later position of Peter, either in Jerusalem, before his departure for "another place" (Acts 12:17), or in Antioch, where for a time he was looked upon as the "prince of the apostles," superior to James, John, James the Lord's brother, Andrew, and the rest of the Twelve—and certainly superior to Paul, whose "freedom from the law" seemed to the conservatives to go altogether too far. The commission to Peter, in Matt. 16:19, giving him the right to "bind and loose" (i.e., by decisions as to the interpretation and application of the law or of Jesus' own commands), is apparently shared by other *18:18*. Yet if Peter is only *primus inter pares*, he remains *primus*. The authority is centered in him, according to this passage. It is already within the range of the "monarchical episcopate" claimed by

Ignatius of Antioch, and not far removed from the papal claims which date at least from the second century.

**Bibliography.** Commentaries: W. C. Allen, ICC (1907); A. Plummer (1909); A. H. McNeile (1915); P. A. Micklem, WC (1917); H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. I (1922; Index to the 4 vols., 1956); E. Klostermann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (1927); C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (2 vols.; 2nd ed., 1927); B. T. D. Smith, Cambridge Greek Testament (1927; also in Cambridge Bible); T. H. Robinson, *The Moffatt Commentary* (1928); F. W. Green, Clarendon Bible (1945); S. E. Johnson, *IB* (1951); F. C. Grant, *Harper's Annotated Bible* (1955).

For the order of the gospels in various MSS, see the lists in E. J. Goodspeed, *The Making of the NT* (1926), Appendix.

On the question of the text followed by Matthew, which at times agrees with the LXX, at others with the MT, at still others with neither, see McNeile's Commentary (1915) or S. Johnson, "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew," *HTR*, XXXVI (1943), 135-53.

Other works: P. Wernle, *Die Synoptische Frage* (1899); G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (3 vols.; 1927-30); B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (1930); W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzeri im ältesten Christentum* (1934); P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (1934); A. Barr, *A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships* (1938); G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1946); M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (2nd ed., 1954).

For further bibliography, see F. C. Grant, *The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth* (1957), pp. 203-7. F. C. GRANT

**MATTHEW, MARTYRDOM OF.** A late, long-winded, and very confused account of the martyrdom of Matthew at the hands of the king of the Anthropophagi (cannibals), to whose city he had been ordered to return by Christ. The account is clearly dependent upon the Acts of Andrew and Matthias (see ANDREW AND MATTHIAS, ACTS OF), but is in no sense a consistent sequel.

Matthew, "a publican but now called an apostle by the Lord crucified by the Jews," has replaced Matthias in the older story. A church is in the land, with Plato as its bishop, but there is little other evidence of the earlier successful labors. The account is a loosely strung-together tale of Matthew's arrival at the city, his planting of a rod given him for this purpose by Christ, its speedy growth into a tree with resultant marvels; the exorcism of the demon Asmodeus from the wife and family of the king; Matthew's martyrdom by fire, in the course of which the fire had been as dew to him but had consumed the metal idols and had chased the king to his palace, whence he had returned as a momentary suppliant begging for aid; the burial of Matthew in an iron coffin, sealed with lead and sunk secretly at night in the sea by the once-more hostile king; the reappearance of Matthew on the sea, with two men in shining apparel and led by Christ in the form of a child; the emergence from the sea of the cross and at its end the iron casket; the long-delayed conversion of the king and his ordination, under the new name Matthew, to become the bishop of the city.

This is an example of the low ebb reached by many of these later apocryphal Acts. There is no apparent interest in either religion or dogma, orthodox or otherwise. It is simply a farrago of wonder tales appropriated from earlier sources, each one

men will weep and gnash their teeth. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

—Matthew 13.41-43a (italics added)

It must be pointed out, however, that two other passages in Matthew also speak of the Kingdom of the Son of Man or the Kingdom of Jesus (which, for the Evangelist, would surely be identical with the Kingdom of the Son of Man) and that neither of these passages unequivocally identifies the Kingdom of the Son of Man with the Church in the present age. Matthew 16,28 reads: "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." The parallels in Mark 9,1 (which speaks of the Kingdom of God coming "with power") and in Luke 9,27 (which speaks simply of the Kingdom of God) do not mention the future coming of the Son of Man, and it appears that the Matthean version of this saying is a modification representing the distinctive theology of the Evangelist himself.<sup>13</sup> The implication clearly is that the Kingdom of the Son of Man is expected to come in the future. But does "future" here mean future from the standpoint of the Evangelist (in which case the Kingdom of the Son of Man could not possibly be identical with the Church in the present age) or simply future from the standpoint of the historical Jesus (in which case the coming of the Kingdom of the Son of Man might be identified with the birth of the Church)? The same ambiguity appears in the other relevant passage, Matthew 20,21, which speaks of "your (=Jesus') kingdom." The parallel in Mark 10,35-37, which reads "your glory" rather than "your kingdom," suggests again the presence of a peculiarly Matthean concept of the Kingdom. And, again, the implication clearly is that this Kingdom of Jesus (=Kingdom of the Son of Man) is expected to come in the future, but it is not clear whether this "future" from the standpoint of Jesus' ministry is also regarded as future from the standpoint of the Evangelist. Thus, neither Matthew 16,28 nor 20,21 can be used to support the distinction between the Kingdom of the Son of Man (=the Church in the present age) and the future Kingdom of the Father.

It is highly significant, moreover, that Matthew 16,28 speaks of the Son of Man "coming in (or with) his kingdom," thus apparently equating the Son of Man with the coming of the Kingdom of the Son of Man. And it is quite clear elsewhere that Matthew regards the coming of the Son of Man as an eschatological event in the future (see, for example, Matthew 16,27; 24,29-31; and 26,64, all of which have parallels in both Mark and Luke; Matthew 24,26-27, 37-41, 42-44, which have parallels in See, 1967), pp. 16-17. Norman Perrin *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper

Luke; and particularly Matthew 10,23; 24,3; and 25,31-46, which are found only in Matthew).

Even more significant is the fact that there are two passages in Matthew (both of them unique to Matthew) which unequivocally refer to the rule of the Son of Man (or of Jesus) in an eschatological sense, though the first of these does not use the terms "Kingdom" or "King." Matthew 19,28 has Jesus saying to the disciples: "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (see the similar statement in Luke 22,29-30: "As my Father appointed a kingdom for me, so do I appoint for you that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel"). The well-known passage, Matthew 25,31-46, also speaks of a time at the end "when the Son of man comes in his glory" and sits on his glorious throne to separate the sheep from the goats at the Last Judgment.

This brief survey of relevant passages in Matthew suggests, therefore, that the Evangelist apparently regards the coming of the Kingdom of the Son of Man as still future, not already present in the form of the Christian Church, and that he relates the coming of this Kingdom very closely to the Final Judgment. This is also true, of course, of his treatment of the Kingdom of Heaven, and it would be very difficult to deduce from these passages that Matthew makes any distinction between the Kingdom of the Son of Man and the Kingdom of Heaven. How, then, shall we understand Matthew 13,37-43 (Matthew's allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds), which apparently does distinguish between the Kingdom of the Son of Man and the Kingdom of the Father?

First, it should be noted that, although most scholars do identify the Kingdom of the Son of Man here with the Church in the present age, Bultmann rejects this identification and interprets the statement that "they will gather out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evil-doers" to mean "out of the kingdom which will appear *then*," thus seeing even here a reference to the future coming of the Kingdom of the Son of Man, which would be identical with the Kingdom of the Father.<sup>14</sup> Such an interpretation is surely intrinsically possible, and, in light of the passages considered above, it must be regarded as most likely correct.

Furthermore, most commentators have simply assumed that the phrase, "the kingdom of their Father," is equivalent to "the kingdom of God." Nothing more than a look at Mark 11,10a ("Blessed is the kingdom of our

<sup>14</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), p. 187, n.3.

father David that is coming!"), however, is needed to recognize the possibility of another interpretation. The "Father" here might represent some messianic figure and thus be virtually equivalent to "the Son of Man," not "God."<sup>15</sup> Indeed, it is doubtful whether the idea of a "Kingdom of God" plays any real part in the theology of Matthew. The phrase occurs only four times, and, in each case, it apparently was a part of the pre-Matthean tradition which was simply taken over without change by the Evangelist.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 171, argues that the terminology in Mark 11,10a agrees with the religious usage of Psalm 118,25 "in late Judaism as a prayer for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom (now thought to be imminent)" and concludes that the statement is likely original. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957), p. 116, however, asserts that "David is practically nowhere else called 'our father', and there is nowhere at all any mention of the 'coming' of the kingdom of David"; his conclusion is that Mark 11,10a is "presumably a secondary construction"; cf. also Reginald H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 112, who accepts Kümmel's view. Whether the statement in Mark 11,10a is original or secondary, and whether it can be paralleled in pre-Christian Jewish literature, is completely irrelevant to our argument, however. Mark 11,10a demonstrates that it was possible within the early Church to speak of "the kingdom of our father David that is coming," and nothing more is needed at this point.

Matthew 26,29, which has Jesus speaking of "my Father's kingdom," does not necessarily invalidate the argument, for here, as in Matthew 13,43, the "Father" is not explicitly identified as God; it is true that the parallels in Mark 14,25 and Luke 22,18 do refer to "the kingdom of God," but the question must be raised as to why Matthew has changed "the kingdom of God" to "my Father's kingdom" (assuming, of course, that it was Matthew who made the change, not Mark and Luke).

<sup>16</sup> Matthew 12,28 ("But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you") is paralleled in Luke 11,20 ("But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you"), and the authenticity of the Lucan version has been vigorously defended; see, e.g., Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 63-65. Matthew 19,24 ("Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God") is found almost verbatim in Mark 10,25 and Luke 18,25 and thus is almost certainly not original with Matthew; furthermore, it should be noted that Matthew himself uses the term "Kingdom of Heaven" in the preceding verse, where the Marcan and Lucan parallels both read "Kingdom of God." Matthew 21,31b ("Jesus said to them, 'Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you'"), though it is not paralleled in the other Synoptic Gospels, appears to be the original conclusion of the Parable of the Two Sons and thus is clearly pre-Matthean; see Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 80. And Matthew 21,43 ("Therefore I tell you, the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it") also appears to be pre-Matthean; see Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 37-38. Three other passages refer either to "his (= God's) kingdom" (Matthew 6,33), "thy (= God's) kingdom"

Normally, however, Matthew changes the terminology to "Kingdom of Heaven" or simply "Kingdom," not because as a pious Jew he shrinks from using the divine name, and not necessarily because this usage more accurately reflects the Semitic idiom of the historical Jesus,<sup>17</sup> but rather because "Kingdom of Heaven" fits better with his theology of the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom. But even if Matthew does in this passage equate "Father" with "God," as he certainly does elsewhere in the Gospel, this does not necessarily imply that he is thereby distinguishing between two Kingdoms, or even two successive stages of the same Kingdom. As Bultmann has observed, the NT is full of "naive pronouncements" which virtually equate Jesus and God, *so far as Jesus' function is concerned*.<sup>18</sup> Thus, Matthew might easily speak of one and the same Kingdom as both the "Kingdom of the Son of Man" (= Jesus) and the "Kingdom of the Father" (= God). Indeed, in the final analysis, his theology would require that the Kingdom of the Son of Man be also regarded as the Kingdom of the Father.

### III

In light of the overall evidence, therefore, it appears that the distinction between the Kingdom of the Son of Man and the Kingdom of the Father and the identification of the former with the Christian Church in the present age simply cannot be substantiated. Matthew speaks of *one* Kingdom, which he regards as still future (though imminent); he normally designates this Kingdom as "the Kingdom of Heaven" (literally, "the Kingdom of the Heavens") or simply "the Kingdom," and the key figure in his view of the Kingdom is not God, but the coming Son of Man.

WILLIAM O. WALKER, JR.  
Trinity University  
San Antonio, Texas

(Matthew 6,10), or "my Father's kingdom" (Matthew 26,29), but, in each case, the saying is paralleled in one or both of the other Synoptics and thus appears to be pre-Matthean.

<sup>17</sup> It is true that "Kingdom of the Heavens" is much more frequent in the Jewish Rabbinic literature than "Kingdom of God"; see Karl Georg Kuhn in *Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. I, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964), pp. 571-574. It is not altogether clear which of the two expressions would most likely have been used by the historical Jesus; see *ibid.*, p. 582.

<sup>18</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, "The Christological Confession of the World Council of Churches," in *Essays, Philosophical and Theological*, trans. James C. G. Greig (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), pp. 281-284.